

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

MAY 25 2005

PATENT**MS160275.01/MSFTP173US****CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being faxed to (703) 872-9306 on the date shown below to Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Date: 5/25/05Casey L. Martin
Casey L. Martin**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re patent application of:

Applicant(s): Erin M. Bourke-Dunphy *et al.*

Examiner: Kuo Liang J. Tang

Serial No: 09/710,143

Art Unit: 2122

Filing Date: November 10, 2000

Title: LOCATION-BASED SCENARIOS TO FACILITATE SELECTION OF
SYSTEM CONFIGURATION

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY BRIEF

Dear Sir:

Applicants' representative submits this supplemental reply brief in response to the Supplemental Examiner's Answer mailed March 25, 2005.

09/710,143

MS160275.01/MSFTP173US

REMARKS

This is in Reply to the Supplemental Examiner's Answer dated March 25, 2005. It is respectfully submitted that various contentions asserted in the Supplemental Examiner's Answer as well as previous arguments made by the Examiner in connection with rejection of claims of the subject application are without merit. The below-noted comments re-address and further emphasize deficiencies of the Examiner's bases for relying on the cited art in connection with rejecting claims of the subject patent application.

The Supplemental Examiner's Answer notes that "In the Examiner's Answer ... 'The amendment after final rejection filed on 12/23/2003' should be 'Reply to Final Office Action Dated September 24, 2003 filed on 12/23/2003' and 'The amendment after final rejection filed on 3/17/2004' should be 'Reply to Advisory Action Dated January 13, 2005 filed on 3/17/2005.'" (See pg. 2). Applicants' representative respectfully reiterates that no claims were amended in either the Reply to Final Office Action dated September 24, 2003, which was filed on December 23, 2003, or the Reply to Advisory Action dated January 13, 2005, which was filed on March 17, 2005. Thus, the above noted alterations in the Supplemental Examiner's Answer do not cure the incorrect statements related to the Status of Amendments After Final in the Examiner's Answer dated August 11, 2004.

Moreover, Amberg *et al.* does not teach or suggest a setup component that receives information indicative of a *location scenario related to where the software system is being installed* as recited in independent claim 1 (and similarly in independent claims 7, 8, and 15). The Supplemental Examiner's Answer intimates that "each ... 'order' is, at least, equivalent to each 'location scenario'" and "[b]ecause in Amberg *et al.*, at least each order, build-to-order, must return back to a unique identifier (specific location scenario) according to a customer-specific information...; the build-to-order is also provided to the software installation and testing system. (See Supplemental Examiner's Answer, pg. 2) (emphasis removed and citations omitted). Applicants' representative respectfully avers to the contrary.

Amberg *et al.* discloses that a target computer system order can be converted into a record called a BAR file. (See col. 5, ll. 54-56). The BAR file can include customer-

09/710,143

MS160275.01/MSFTP173US

specific information such as a name, an address, and a phone number. (See col. 5, ll. 63-65). Although the BAR file can comprise an address, the address is not related to where the software system is being installed – instead, it is associated with a location of a customer. Amberg *et al.* is silent regarding a location scenario related to *where the software system is being installed*. Thus, Amberg *et al.* fails to teach or suggest such aspects recited in the subject claims.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, in view of the above comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



David W. Grillo
Reg. No. 52,970

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731